

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed December 23, 2005.

Claims 1 through 6 and 12 through 23 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 through 6 and newly added claims 18 through 23 are currently under examination.

Claims 12 through 17 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicants herein acknowledge the Restriction Requirement in the above-referenced application, and affirm the election to prosecute the invention of the claims of Group I, claims 1 through 6, without further traverse.

Claims 1 through 6 stand rejected.

Applicants have amended claim 1, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on Hammond et al. (U.S. Patent 5,950,071)

Claims 1 through 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter referred to as "AAPA") in view of Hammond et al. (U.S. Patent 5,950,071).

Applicant asserts that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicant has amended the claimed inventions to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicant asserts that any combination of AAPA and the Hammond et al. reference does not and cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claim 1 and newly added independent claim 18 because any combination of such cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed inventions.

Turning to the cited prior art, AAPA teaches or suggests mounting a semiconductor die to a substrate and encapsulation.

The Hammond et al. reference teaches or suggests ablative or non-ablative laser methods of particle desorption. At high laser intensities, a thin surface layer of material is removed. Like chemical etching, laser ablation tends to micro-roughen the surface, making the process generally unsuitable for semiconductor or FPD cleaning methods.

Applicant asserts that any combination of AAPA and the Hammond et al. reference does not and cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claim 1 and newly added independent claim 18 because any combination of such cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claim 1 and newly added claim 18 calling for "[a] semiconductor device having a portion thereof formed from a wafer of semiconductive material by a laser etching process comprising . . . a substrate of semiconductive wafer material having a surface . . . a semiconductor device having a portion thereof attached to a portion of the substrate . . . an interposer connected to the substrate, the interposer having a roughened surface formed by a laser increasing the surface area thereof to adhere mold material thereto in a molding operation . . . resist on at least a portion of the surface of the substrate of semiconductive wafer material having a portion thereof removed by etching the resist from the surface of the substrate using a laser" and "[a] semiconductor

device having a portion thereof formed from a wafer of semiconductive material by a laser etching process comprising . . . a substrate of semiconductive material . . . a semiconductor device located on one side of the substrate; an interposer located on the other side of the substrate, the interposer having a roughened surface formed by a laser increasing the surface area thereof to adhere mold material thereto in a molding operation . . . and resist on at least a portion of the surface of the substrate of semiconductive wafer material having a portion thereof removed by etching the resist from the surface of the substrate using a laser”. In contrast to the claim limitations of the claimed inventions, the AAPA merely teaches a semiconductor device on a substrate while the Hammond et al. reference teaches or suggests that a laser is unsuitable for the removal of a thin layer of a substrate and a combination of AAPA and the Hammond et al. reference teaches or suggests the use of a laser to remove a portion of the substrate of AAPA is unsuitable.

Therefore, presently amended independent claim 1 and newly added independent claim 18 are allowable as well as dependent claims 2 through 6 and 19 through 23 therefrom.

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner’s comments, Applicant has amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicant requests entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

The amendment does not require any further search or consideration.

Applicant submits that claims 1 through 6 and 18 through 23 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant requests the entry of this amendment, the allowance of claims 1 through 6 and 18 through 23, and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James R. Duzan".

James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: February 23, 2006
JRD/djp:lmh
Document in ProLaw